Les flux de main-d'œuvre et de capitaux chinois vers les États-Unis

Jan Chien Chen LIN

Les « Chinatowns » ou « villes chinoises » américaines ont subi des transformations considérables depuis leur création au milieu du XIX^e siècle. Ces changements sont dûs à l'évolution structurelle des flux de main-d'œuvre et de capitaux chinois vers les États-Unis. Les différents paramètres de ces flux de main-d'œuvre et de capitaux sont la réglementation fédérale et les changements macro-économique au niveau de l'économie mondiale.

Cet article examine le développement historique des chinatowns américaines en fonction des grands changements économiques et de la politique américaine en matière d'immigration. Nous examinons ici leurs conditions d'apparition tant en Asie du Sud Est qu'aux États-Unis. Constituant à l'origine des enclaves de petits entrepreneurs, les chinatowns des États-Unis sont actuellement restructurées matériellement et économiquement par d'importants flux financiers extérieurs. Ces transitions se traduisent parfois par des conflits d'intérêts entre grand capital et population modeste.

Changing patterns of chinese labor and capital flow to the US

Jan Chien-Chen LIN

American Chinatowns have been through considerable transformations since their first appearance in the mid-nineteenth century. These changes are a consequence of shifting patterns of Chinese labor and capital flow to the US. Regulatory government legislation and macro-economic shifts on the level of the world-economy are the parameters to that labor and capital inflow into the US.

This paper examines the historical development of US Chinatowns from the context of broad economic shifts and US immigration policy. Economic conditions in East Asia are examined as much as conditions in the US. Beginning as enclaves of petty entreprenurial activity, Chinatowns in the US are now being physically and economically restructured by a grand flow of investment capital. These transitions have led in some cases to developmental conflicts.

El flujo de Mano de Obra y de Capitales Chinos hacia los Estados Unidos

Jan Chien-Chen LIN

Los « Chinatowns » o « ciudades chinas » norteamericanas han sufrido transformaciones considerables desde su creación a mediados del siglo XIX. Estos cambios se deben a la evolución estructural de flujos de mano de obra y de capitales chinos hacia los Estados Unidos. Los diferentes parámetros de estos flujos de mano de obra y de capitales son la reglamentación federal y los cambios macroeconómicos a nivel de la economía mundial.

Este artículo examina el desarrollo histórico de Chinatowns norteamericanos en función de grandes cambios económicos y de la política norteamericana en materia de immigración. Examinamos aquí sus condiciones de aparición tanto en el sur-este del Asia como en Estados Unidos. Contituyendo originalmente clivages de pequeños empresarios, actualmente los chinatown de Estados Unidos son reestructurados materialmente y económicamente por importantes flujos finacieros extranjeros. Estas transiciones se traducen a veces por conflictos de intereses entre gran capital y población modesta.

Revue Européenne
des Migrations Internationales
Volume 8 - N° 3
1992

Divergent Diasporas : The Chinese Communities of New York and Los Angeles Compared

Roger WALDINGER
Yenfen TSENG

Assimilation is the grand theme of American immigration research. The classic sociological position, developed by the Chicago school, provided an optimistic counter to the dim assessments of the new immigrants prevalent at the early part of the century. Notwithstanding the marked differences that impressed contemporaries, Park, Burgess, Thomas and others contended that the new immigrant groups would lose their cultural distinctiveness and move up the occupational hierarchy. Milton Gordon's now classic volume distilled the essence of the sociological view : immigrant groups start at the bottom and gradually move up ; their mobility takes place through individual advancement, not group collective action ; in the process of moving up, ethnic groups lose their distinctive social structure ; and as ethnics become like members of the core group, they become part of the core group, joining it in neighborhoods, in friendship, and eventually in marriage([1]).

In retrospect it is clear that the assimilation model abstracted from the experience of turn-of-the century immigration to the United States. At the time, immigrants were a homogeneous population of persons narrowly concentrated at the bottom of the occupational scale : with domestic servants and general laborers dominating the ranks of the foreign-born, it was reasonable to assume that most newcomers were similarly low-skilled and therefore entered at the lowest levels([2]). But diversity is the salient characteristic of the new, post-1965 immigrants to the United States, who not only differ from one another in national origin, but in skills and prior experiences. Thus, a continuing influx of low-skilled workers, with educational levels well below native levels, maintains the pattern inherited from the past. But the distinctive shape of the new immigration comes from the simulta-

neous arrival of large numbers of immigrants who bring professional, entrepreneurial, and educational backgrounds that exceeding native levels, characteristics that catapult them into the middle class(3).

While socio-economic diversity is a salient trait of the post-1965 newcomers, immigration scholars have yet to consider its full implication. Portes and Rumbaut correctly argue, in their recent synthetic work, *Immigrant America,* that diversity makes the « view of a uniform assimilation process... implausible »(4). Portes and Rumbaut emphasize *inter*-ethnic differences, contending that national origin groups will develop distinctive trajectories of incorporation. But *intra-ethnic* diversity increasingly characterizes the immigrant groups converging on the United States. Many come from multi-ethnic polities, such as the states of the Caribbean, the Middle East, or South Asia ; consequently, « internal ethnicity », the presence of ethnic groups within a single national origin group, is a common feature, as Bozorgmehr as hargued(5). Intra-ethnic class stratification is an equally important feature as the growing interpenetration of the US and the world economy, especially in the Pacific Rim, pulls in migrants from a variety of class strata within source countries.

Intra-ethnic diversity challenges the assumption of assimilation theory that immigrants start at the bottom. It also calls into question the notion that members of a single ethnic group follow a common pattern of adaptation. This paper uses a comparison of the Chinese communities in Los Angeles and New York to show the importance of intra-immigrant diversity and the difference it makes. We argue that these two communities began from similar starting points, each exhibiting the social structure that had been commonly developed by Chinese-American communities during the first 100 years of the Chinese presence in the United States. While both communities have undergone tremendous growth since the renewal of mass Chinese immigration in the mid-1960s, their patterns of development have increasingly diverged. Whereas Los Angeles has become the favored destination of middle — and upper — middle-class immigrants, many of them from Taïwan, New York has received a heavily proletarian population originating in the People's Republic of China (PRC) and Hong Kong. These initial differences in the characteristics of arrivals have led to divergent trajectories of ethnic incorporation. In Los Angeles, the Chinese have engaged in « leapfrog migration »(6) settling in middle class suburban areas ; in New York, by contrast, the Chinese population remains tied to the inner city, with a heavy concentration in a traditional Chinatown. In both cities, the Chinese have developed vibrant immigrant economies, but in Los Angeles, the Chinese economic base rests on higher value-added, higher-skilled activities, whereas in New York, the low wage, low-skilled garment and restaurant industries undergird the ethnic economy. Patterns of political participation are equally divergent : in Los Angeles, the Chinese have experienced considerable conflict over political influence in middle-class cities where they comprise an increasingly large portion of the population ; in New York, where a system of political ethnic segmentation predated the arrival of the new immigrants, the Chinese have been incorporated as junior partners, involved in the usual fare of ethnic politics, but providing little threat to established ethnic elites.

We begin with an overview of Chinese immigration to the United States and then briefly contrast the histories of the Chinese in Los Angeles and New York. Subsequent sections compare residential, economic, and political patterns.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION TO THE UNITED STATES

The Chinese presence in the United States dates back to the mid-19th century, a by-product of the California gold-rush and the labor shortage it sparked. Imported to work on the railroads and in mines, the Chinese found themselves the targets of extraordinary hostility from white workers. White antagonism eventuated in the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, which quickly reduced the flow of persons from China from 40,000 in 1882 to 10 persons in 1887.

Exclusion remained in force until World War II, when the US alliance with China led to repeal of the 1882 legislation, though the national origins provisions of the 1924 Immigration and Naturalization Act kept a low ceiling on future migration from China. In the event, wartime disrupted travel across the Pacific ; thus, it took the Chinese Revolution of 1949 to spur the second wave of Chinese immigration to the US. Roughly 30,000 refugees, many of whom were well-educated and professionally trained Nationalist government officials, members of the business elite, and intellectuals, fled to the US along with their immediate relatives. An additional 5,000 Chinese students studying in the US and stranded there were given refugee status as well. The next fifteen years saw the admission of another 60,000 Chinese immigrants, most of whom were students who obtained science and engineering degrees and acquired immigrant status by virtue of their professional skills.

These two early waves differed markedly in social composition and settlement patterns. The early immigrants stemmed from the southern coastal province of Kwangtung and were people of peasant origin with little education who spoke similar dialects. After violence and anti-Chinese legislation forced them out of the mainstream economy, they regrouped into the Chinatowns where they were confined to lines of trade that required long hours, hard work, cheap labor, and low profit margins, and hence posed little competitive threat to whites.

By contrast, the second wave was a more elite group, originating from a variety of areas in China and Taïwan. Once in the United States, they dispersed to the major urban centers, finding residence and employment outside the Chinatowns, which served them as a marketplace for food and recreation(8). With the newcomers scattering, and the second generation increasingly moving into the mainstream economy, Chinatowns dwindled in population and size. Remaining behind was an older generation of Chinese, « the owners of small groceries and laundry shops ; the aging bachelors, a younger group of men who had entered Chinatown as « paper sons » during the forties, spoke no English, and depended for their living on employment in the restaurants, markets, and small factories which served the community »(9).

The third wave of Chinese immigration began in 1965, when the Hart-Cellar Act abolished both the country of origin quotas *and* the exclusions against Asian immigrants and set a 20,000 person quota for any country of the world. The 1965 immigration law allocated these immigration entries according to two criteria : close family ties to United States citizens or residents, or possession of scarce skills. Like other Asian newcomers, Chinese initially moved to the United States through the skilled labor preferences ; these first settlers quickly built up a population base that enabled their less-educated, close relatives to move to the United States on the basis of family preferences(10).

Chinese immigration accelerated rapidly in the aftermath of the Hart-Celler Act. Hith rates of naturalization among Chinese immigrants allowed increasing numbers of their relatives to enter above the 20,000 person per country ceiling. In 1979, the United States recognized the People's Republic of China, which added an additional 20,000 person quota to the quotas previously available for immigrants from Taïwan and Hong Kong. These changes translated into greatly expanded numbers, lifting the flow from 109,771 Chinese immigrants during the 1960s to 444,962 during the 1980s([11]).

With growth has come greater diversity. Occupationnaly, the new immigrants fall between two extremes, with a concentration of service workers and poorly paid manufacturing operatives, at one end, and professional and technical workers on the other. According to the 1980 US census, some 42 percent of employed Chinese immigrants were engaged in managerial, technical, and administrative occupations and another 51 % were found in menial, labor-intensive service occupations or in unskilled or semiskilled blue-collared jobs. A similar split characterized those migrants of the 1985-1990 period who reported pre-migration work experience : of this group, 38 % had previously been employed as professionals and managers, but 46 % had previously been engaged as blue-collar workers, service workers, and peasants([12]).

TABLEAU 1 : *Selected Characteristics of Chinese immigrants by country of birth, 1990*

	People's Republic of China %	Taïwan %
Admitted by occupation preference	17	42
Intended residency		
Los Angeles	11	22
New York	28	9
Pre-immigration occupation :		
Blue-collar, farmer, service	60	15
Professionnals & Managerial	30	66

1990 INS Annual Report

The diversity reflects the distinctive migration flows generated by each Chinese source area — Taïwan, Hong-Kong, and the PRC. Highly educated professionals or managers dominate the Taïwanese flow. A high proportion — 42 % in 1990 — of these newcomers enter under the occupational categories reserved for highly skilled workers and their families. And Los Angeles is their chief destination in the United States, absorbing just over one fifth of the Taïwanese who arrived during the latter half of the 1980s. By contrast, the PRC sends a much less skilled population : 60 % of the 1990 PRC immigrants with prior occupational experience had previously worked in blue-collar, agricultural, or service jobs, in comparison to 15 % among the Taïwanese. Unlike the Taïwanese, almost all PRC immigrants — 83 % in 1990 — enter under family preferences. And their ties to relatives already settled in the United States directs them to New York, which boasts the largest Chinese population concentration. Though New York captured less than 10 % of the 1990 Taïwanese immigrants, it absorbed 28 % of the 1990 newcomers from the PRC([13]).

THE TWO COMMUNITIES IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The Chinese communities in Los Angeles and New York date back to the 1870s. New York's Chinatown, located on the Lower East Side of Manhattan where countless immigrants have settled, grew rapidly in the late 19th century, as Chinese laborers sought out less hostile environments, away from California. By 1900, there were 6,321 Chinese in New York City, up from approximately 500 in 1873. Natural growth and renewed immigration after World War II gradually boosted the Chinese population to 33,000 in 1960. Prohibited from working in a wide variety of professional and non-professional occupations until the 1940s, Chinese New Yorkers only gradually abandoned the ethnic economy. In 1960, 40 % of employed Chinese New Yorkers was engaged in trade, most presumably in restaurants, and another 25 % made their livelihood in the laundry business. Similarly, Chinatown remained an important population center, retaining just under a third of the City's Chinese population by 1960([14]).

Los Angeles Chinese community grew fitfully, remaining a pale shadow of San Francisco, with as few as 5,000 Chinese residing in Los Angeles in the 1940s. The onset of World War II relaxed restrictions against the Chinese : many abandoned the traditional occupations and entered the military, the shipyards, and the civil service. With the removal of the Japanese to internment camps during the war, the Chinese filled vacated businesses whenever possible, especially in the main wholesale market and among grocery stores. Thanks to post-war immigration, the number of Chinese Angelenos grew to 19,400 in 1960. But in contrast to New York, Chinatown lost its hold on the area's Chinese population ; with dispersion accelerated after 1948 with a Supreme Court decision outlawing housing covenants, fewer than 1,000 Chinese were still living in Chinatown as of 1960. Though Los Angeles' Chinese population was also better educated than New York's, it was nonetheless equally tied to the ethnic economy, with 40 % of employed Chinese working in trade as of 1960([15]).

Previously similar, these two communities have been transformed by the growing numbers and diversification of Chinese immigration in very different ways. By 1980, Los Angeles' Chinese population was already heavily weighted toward newcomers from Taïwan while also including a large population of overseas Chinese, many of whom came with entrepreneurial experience. By contrast, both Taïwanese and overseas Chinese had a limited presence in New York, whose Chinese population was dominated by newcomers from the PRC and Hong Kong. These disparate national origins yielded divergent class characteristics, already visible by 1980. Los Angeles Chinese reported considerably higher schooling levels than their New York counterparts, with the educational differential holding for the population overall and for each sub-ethnic group. Chinese Angelenos held similarly advantaged positions in the economy, as indicated by the occupational prestige score, with a disparity, relative to New York, holding for every sub-ethnic group.

Since 1980, the class characteristics of Chinese immigrants arriving to Los Angeles and New York have continued to diverge. In 1986, for example, professionals and executives comprised 57 % of all Chinese immigrants with prior occupational experience who moved to Los Angeles, but only 16 % of those who settled in New York. By contrast, 50 % of the New York-bound ground were former laborers and farmers, in contrast to 19 % among those who made Los Angeles their home. Whereas these differences largely result from the disparities in the national origins of the immigrants, the Los Angeles-bound immigrants report higher occupational backgrounds whether originating in Hong Kong, Taïwan, or the PRC.

TABLE 2 : *Selected Socioeconomic characteristics of Chinese in Los Angeles and New York by the country of birth, 1980*

	China/ Hong-Kong	Taïwan	Overseas
Occupational Prestige Score NY	27.2	39.1	37.6
LA	38.6	46.1	36.4
Yrs schooling completed NY	9.4	13.5	12.8
LA	12.6	15.3	13.2

Source : US Census of Population, 1980, Public Use Microdata Sample ; data for employed, foreign-born, 20-65 only.

Note : The occupational prestige score is Duncan's Occupational Socioeconomic Index, updated for application to the 1980 census occupational classification. The index has a range of 0 to 100. Years of school completed range from 0 to 18 ; in the United States, 8 years of schooling indicates completion of elementary education ; 12 years, secondary education ; 16 years, college graduation (bachelor's degree). Overseas Chinese include persons born in Asia in countries other than China, Hong Kong, Taïwan, or Macao and indicating Chinese « race » on the 1980 Census.

TABLE 3 : *Pre-migration Occupational Background of Chinese Immigrants by Country of Last Residence and Intended Place of Residence, 1986*

Occupation	New York				Los Angeles			
	Total %	H.K. %	PRC %	Taïwan %	Total %	H.K. %	PRC	Taïwan
Executive	7	13	2	20	21	23	5	30
Professional	11	8	11	19	26	17	20	33
Farmer	27	1	41	1	8	1	25	1
Laborer	23	22	27	4	11	15	25	2
Precision	6	13	4	4	3	5	3	3
Services	12	23	6	24	8	11	8	7
Teacher	13	18	9	28	22	27	13	24
TOTAL	4 609	1 058	2 958	593	2 935	610	846	1 479

Source : Immigration and Naturalization Service, Public Use Sample, 1986.

Note : H.K. : Hong Kong ; PRC : People's Republic of China.

SETTLEMENT

Established sociological theories suggest that the tendency toward concentrated, centralized settlements, followed by turn-of-the-century immigrants to the United States, is a recurrent pattern. In this view, structural forces, as well as the characteristics of the migration streams themselves, generate distinctive ethnic neighborhoods. Newcomers can be expected to settle in old, inner-city neighborhoods, close to their jobs in the Central Business District. Dispersion from these initial concentrations will take place with a rise in socio-economic status ; deconcentration denotes a trend toward assimilation([16]).

New York : The history of Chinese settlement in New York hews closely to the expected, traditional pattern, though evolving in some different ways. A small Chinese population had always bordered New York's historic immigrant concentration on the Lower East Side of Manhattan. But the advent of the new immigration changed to geography of Chinatown, pushing the newcomers over the boundaries that had traditionally separated Chinatown from the other, adjacent immigrant neighborhoods. From the 1950s on, Chinatown steadily expanded from its original concentration in part of a single census tracts([17]). By 1970, seven of eight continuous tracts including the original Chinatown were over one-quarter Chinese and three were over half Chinese ; a decade later, all eight tracts were over one-quarter Chinese and four were over half Chinese ; by 1990, seven of the eight were over half Chinese, and one was more than 30 % Chinese([18]).

Population expansion has packed Chinatown's newest arrivals into the city's largest concentration of badly deteriorated, most obsolete housing. This pattern is clearly a case of history repeating itself, as many of the new arrivals are living in buildings originally constructed to house European immigrants one hundred years ago. In 1980, « old law » tenements built prior to 1901 comprised almost 40 % of all housing units on the Lower East side, and almost 50 % of the units in the core Chinatown area([19]). But the Chinese are disproportionately over-represented in these oldest buildings ; and as their numbers have increased, so too has overcrowding. As a result, the old arrangements that enabled newly arrived immigrants to gain a foothold in Chinatown ever since the beginning days of the community have revived, with sub-divided apartments providing newcomers shelter in a *gong si fong*, a traditional « public room »([20]).

The Chinatown phenomenon has a familiar historical resonance ; but rather than reminding us of the past, it brings out the distinctive characteristics of the new immigration. The Chinese are the only one of New York's many new immigrant groups to converge on the old neighborhoods that had traditionally harbored earlier immigrant waves. Only one other group — immigrants from the Dominican Republic — has been equally likely to settle in Manhattan([21]).

Instead, immigrants have flocked to the older, quasi-suburban areas within the boundaries of New York City, where the quality of housing and neighborhood amenities is much superior to Chinatown. In 1980, Chinatown was home to barely one-fourth of the city's Chinese ; in 1990, with a greatly expanded population, it housed a still sizeable, but considerably smaller fraction. The great bulk of new-

comers settled in the quasi-suburban areas instead, of which the borough of Queens was the most important. More than 60 % of the net 1980-1990 Chinese population gain occurred in these quasi-suburban, « outer borough » areas.

In their tendency to converge on quasi-suburban areas, the Chinese have both resembled and differed from other Asian immigrants. Within New York City boundaries, the quasi-suburban areas have seen the development of an « Asian belt » in Queens, running through the northern part of the borough, and in which Chinese, Asian Indians, and Koreans have established mixed Asian concentrations. Within this area, Flushing has developed as a satellite Chinatown, having a particular strong attraction for more affluent and middle-class immigrants. Though the outward flow from Chinatown was underway by 1980, sizeable concentrations had yet to be established. By 1990, however, the satellite Chinatowns now grouped together sizeable population clusters, with two census tracts in Brooklyn more than 30 % Chinese, and another seven in Flushing more than 15 % Chinese.

But unlike Koreans and Asian Indians, Chinese remain anchored to New York City. The former two groups have move heavily into the city's suburbs ; in 1980, for example, 48 % of the New York region's Asian Indians lived in outside the city's boundaries ; a decade later, 52 % of the region's Asian Indians were suburbanites. The Chinese, however, have been slow to move beyond city boundaries. In 1980, New York City contained 75 % of the region's 163,597 Chinese residents ; a decade later, city residents comprised virtually the same portion of an expanded regional population numbering 320,120.

Los Angeles : Whereas New York conforms closely to the patterns established by immigrants in the past, Los Angeles offers a contrasting case. Los Angeles' Chinatown, smaller to begin with than New York's, had little attraction for the post-War immigrants, and it was not until the late 1960s that it experienced any significant population gain. But only a trickle of immigrants filtered into Chinatown. By 1970, it contained just over 4,000 Chinese residents, less than 10 percent of the county's total. By 1980, the number had increased slightly to 6,661, and then added another 1,500 over the next ten years. Though these gains produced an area of extraordinary Chinese density — over 75 % — Chinatown captured only a small portion of the area's population increase. In 1990, when 245,033 Chinese lived in Los Angeles county, only 4 % made their homes in the traditional Chinatown(22).

Instead of converging on Chinatown, the immigrants headed out of the boundaries of Los Angeles City, moving eastward into suburban areas in the San Gabriel Valley. They first went to Monterey Park, a racially mixed, independent municipality twenty minutes from downtown Los Angeles, where a small, but significant population of second — and third-generation Chinese had already settled. The initial catalyst was a marketing campaign launched by a Chinese-American realtor, Fred Hsieh, who purchased his first piece of Monterey Park real estate in 1972, a modest home in an older section of city. A few years later, when property at bargain rates became available with the death of two of the city's largest landowners, Hsieh opened up his own real estate firm, made several more acquisitions, and began advertising Monterey Park as the « Chinese Beverly Hills » in Taïwanese and Hong Kong newspapers(23).

Once a nucleus of Taïwanese moved to Monterey Park, chain migration quickly spurred the expansion of the Chinese population ; subsequent arrivals moved for proximity to friends and relatives. Due to advertising, some prospective immigrants purchased houses or apartments in Monterey Park through Chinese realtors even before they settled in America. Migrants were also drawn by the presence of other Mandarin-speaking Chinese. As its Taïwanese population grew, Monterey Park became known as « Little Taipei », a self-sufficient community for Mandarin-speaking Chinese, where people without any understanding of English or Cantonese could meet all their needs. Finally, population growth created amenities, in particular, a commercial and banking center that serves the Chinese population, and a sense of community that made the town still more attractive. Thus, Monterey Park became America's first suburban Chinatown. As of 1990, the city was 37 % of the population in Monterey Park in 1990, up from 15 % in 1980(24).

As Monterey Park's Chinese population built-up, newcomers spilled over into other, nearby municipalities in the San Gabriel Valley. The most affluent immigrants converged on the high status city of San Marino, long a bastion of the Angelo elite, where few houses sell for less than half a million dollars and the 1990 median household income was $ 100,000. By 1990, a quarter of San Marino's population was Chinese and half of the children in its school system were Asian, making it the nation's first exclusive suburb to gain such a large immigrant presence. Less affluent, though still middle class Chinese settled in other cities in close proximity to Monterey Park. In Alhambra, an independent municipality directly adjacent to Monterey, the Chinese population quintupled during the 1980s ; by 1990, the city contained 26,000 Chinese residents, making up 26 % of its total population. Consequently, here are now highly dense Chinese concentrations laced among these independent communities in the San Gabriel Valley. Monterey Park contains 4 census tracts in which more than half of the population is Chinese ; another 8 tracts in Monterey Park and Alhambra are more than one-third Chinese(25).

Contrast : Chinese settlement patterns in Los Angeles and New York have evolved in very different ways. From a small pocket in one of the city's oldest immigrant neighborhoods, New York's Chinatown has burgeoned, spilling over into new territory, and clustering Chinese at densities of more than 70 % at its greatly expanded core. While only a minority of the immigrants settle in Chinatown, the rest of the Chinese population remains firmly anchored to New York City, as Table 4 shows, unlike Asian Indians or Koreans, who increasingly suburbanized over the course of the 1980s.

TABLE 4 : *Settlement Patterns in New York among various Asian groups, 1980 and 1990*

	Total %	Asians %	Chinese %	Asian Indian %
1980				
Total region (pop. in 000s)	1 919 0.8	381.6	163.5	89.6
Percent living in :				
New York City	36.8	61.5	76.0	52.1
Manhattan	7.4	19.3	31.9	7.5
Rest of NYC	29.4	42.1	44.1	44.6
Inner Ring	20.2	20.4	9.0	16.9
Rest of region	43.0	18.2	15.0	31.0
1990				
Total region (Pop. in 000s)	19 853.2	822.7	320.1	197.5
Percent living in :				
New York City	36.9	59.5	74.6	47.9
Manhattan	7.3	12.9	22.4	3.7
Rest of NYC	29.6	46.6	52.2	44.1
Inner Ring	19.0	18.5	7.5	12.2
Rest of region	44.1	22.0	17.9	39.9

Source : 1980, 1990 Census of Population.

Note : The New York region is defined as a 31 county area stretching across three states, New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut.

Los Angeles shows the opposite pattern. Not only has Chinatown grown modestly, but Chinese immigrants have moved in a suburban direction. The city's share of Chinese population within the Los Angeles metropolitan area has plunged heavily since 1970. And in sharp contrast to New York, where such a large portion of the immigrants remain in a deteriorated, impoverished neighborhood, the newcomers to Los Angeles have converged on middle-class areas, in some instances entering highly exclusive communities.

TABLE 5 : *Chinese Population in Los Angeles, 1970, 1980, 1990*

	1970	1980	1990
Los Angeles county	40,798	93,747	245,033
Los Angeles City			
Total	27,345	44,353	67,196
Percent of county	67 %	47 %	27 %
Chinese in Chinatown*			
Total	4,218	6,661	8,078
Percent of county	10 %	7 %	4 %

* Chinatown and its immediate communities include census tracts 1971, 1976, 1977, 2071.

Source : 1970. Data : Charles Choy Wong, *Ethnicity, Work and Community : The Case of Chinese in Los Angeles*. Ph. D. Dissertation, Department of Sociology, UCLA, 1979 ; 1980, 1990 data from US Census of Population.

THE ECONOMY

In contrast to the traditional immigrant scenario, in which newcomers start at the bottom by working for natives, the Chinese have taken the ethnic economy route, working for their own kind. Most immigrant entrepreneurs have move into low-profit, low status activities, from which native competitors have largely abandoned. But Los Angeles presents a very different profile, reflecting the unique social and human capital of its Chinese population.

New York : The old Chinese ethnic economy, based on the restaurant, laundry, and tourist trades, is now long gone, reinvigorated and transformed by the massive influx of immigrants and by changes in the relationship of Chinatown to the host society.

In Chinatown, population growth has relegated white tourist trade, an economic mainstay during the first half of the century, to second place behind the wants of local, ethnic consumers. Wherever they live, New York's Chinese immigrants are drawn back to downtown Chinatown to work and shop, creating an atmosphere of an old city market, with hunreds of entrepreneurs tening their own stalls or shops. Bushels of live blue crabs, crates of bok choy, and hordes of intense shoppers crowd the sidewalks of Canal Street, the central business district of Chinatown. Shopkeepers hawk wares from every available nook : batteries and audio tapes, scarfs, T-shifts, jewelry and food of every description, from lobsters to doughnuts. As of 1984, there were hundreds of Chinese retail business located in the Chinatown area ; indeed the pull of the ethnic market was so great as to make commercial rents higher than any in other business area, save the most prestigious downtown locations(26).

Whereas the ethnic trade has replaced the tourist trade as a source of retail business, the growth of restaurants has taken over from the dying laundry business. Behind this boom lies the convergence of supply and demand factors : the influx of immigrants allowed Chinese restaurants to offer a relatively inexpensive meal, just when American lifestyle changes led to a taste for more exotic foods and greater spending on meals made in restaurants, rather than at home. By the late 1980s, 450 restaurants in Chinatown and many others catering to a non-ethnic clientele scatteredthroughout the city employed over 15,000 Chinese restaurant workers(27).

But the expansion of the garment industry is the most dramatic change and the greatest break with the past. In the early 1960s, there was no immigrant industry to speak of, just a handful of small shops. But starting in the late 1960s their numbers quickly grew : by 1970 there were just over a hundred shops ; five years later the number had more than doubled ; by 1980, there were 430 ; since the mid-80s, the count has stood in the neighborhood of 450.

A variety of factors spurred the growth of Chinatown's garment industry. The movement of family units in the new immigration, and the rapidly increasing numbers of women, provided a ready supply of labor for this traditionally female-dominated garment trade. Clothing also had the advantage of being a field in which getting started in a business of one's own was possible with only a little

capital and access to family and kin labor, and the Chinese community's social organization facilitated such resource mobilization.

Once in place, the immigrant garment industry quickly acquired a dynamic of its own. The demand for labor to staff the local garment factories affected the stream of newcomers to New York ; compared to other cities, New York received a disproportionate number of lower-skilled newcomers arriving from China, Hong Kong, and Taïwan. Moreover, while many of the newcomers to New York moved to quasi-suburban areas within the city's boundaries, as we have noted, those immigrants who gravitated into the garment industry were far more likely to settle in Chinatown. In 1980, for example, just under half of the roughly 20,000 Chinese workers who belonged to the Garment Workers' Union lived in Chinatown, compared to a quarter for the city's Chinese population as a whole. For the immigrants, residence in Chinatown provided the convenience of being able to walk to work. Living close to the area's concentration of jobs was also a sort of employement insurance, since if any one employer went under or laid off his workers, there was likely to be another job vacant in one of the scores of factories close at hand. Employers also gained from this arrangement : a nearby source of labor provided a constant supply of workers looking for jobs. Proximity kept teenagers, mothers of young children, and older workers, who might not have commuted long distances to work, readily available for work in a local factory(28).

Over time, population growth has spurred the proliferation of new business and diversification into new business lines. In New York, as Portes and Zhou have pointed out, « services that rely on an ethnic clientele, such as accounting, insurance, real estate agencies, doctors and herbalists, barber and beauty shops, and jewelry stores... experienced tremendous growth » since the onset of the new immigration. Similarly, the vigorous expansion of the Chinese restaurant and garment industries has generated expansion in ancillary fields. The 1984 New York Chinese Business Directory, for example, listed 64 Chinese food wholesalers, 25 restaurant supplies, 6 sewing machine dealers, 4 fabric shops, and 4 purveyors of silk and embroidered material(29).

Los Angeles : In the early years of the new immigration, the Chinese ethnic economy of Los Angeles appeared to follow a New York path. In the mid-1970s, Charles Wong found an economic structure that resembled New York's, with 360 Chinatown firms, of which the most numerous were eating (60), gift (46), selected services (37), import-export firms (34), and garment factories (24). But the Chinatown economy of the time failed to take off. The restaurant industry went into crisis, hurt by the drift of newcomers to the suburbs, which reduced the Chinatown trade. The garment industry similarly experienced stagnation, with population dispersion reducing the availability of co-ethnic workers, and lack of space for new factories reducing the potential for growth(30).

Intra-ethnic conflict also pushed economic developement away from Chinatown and from Los Angeles city boundaries. Wong explains that the Cantonese-speaking Chinese, who controlled Los Angeles Chinatown, resisted commercial development by the Mandarin-speaking Chinese(31). As Mandarin speakers began to settle in Monterey Park, this area became an alternative for Mandarin-speaking businessmen as well(32). In the mid-1970s, some Mandarin-speaking businesses in

Monterey Park emerged in a mini shopping center, named the Ding Ho Market, after one of Taipei's famous shopping square, an equipped with book stores, herb stores, a Mandarin market, bakeries, and restaurants. Subsequent population growth have aded greatly to the demand for local ethnic products an services, with Chinese businesses supplanting white-owned establishments. By 1989, as John Horton has reported, « fourteen out of twenty-one banks were primarily owned by and run for Chinese. The same applied to six out of eight supermarkets »(33).

In addition, two Chinese newspapers with worldwide circulations are either headquartered or have branches on a single street in town. The city also supports more than 60 Chinese restaurants, several Chinese-run nightclubs, as well as medical and law practices, and travel agencies.

Thus, business growth shifted to the newly burgeoning areas of Chinese settlement in the suburbs. While Chinese businesses in Monterey Park and its surrounding cities in San Gabriel Valley proliferated, Los Angeles' Chinatown suffered erosion. For example, in 1983, Chinese businesses in LA Chinatown accounted for almost half of all business establishments in the greater LA area, but in 1992, only 6 % of Chinese businesses were located in Chinatown. On the other hand, about 55 % of Chinese businesses were located in the west San Gabriel Valley with 12 % of them concentrated in the city of Monterey Park(34). Business growth has brought shifts in property-owning patterns as well. Chinese investors have purchased about one third of the commercial land in Monterey Park and continue to look for similar opportunities in nearby cities. The commercial land along the main streets in Monterey Park and Alhambra averaged only three to four dollars a square foot in 1976, but is currently valued at about a hundred dollars.

Along with dispersion from the traditional Chinatown, has come the development of new economic activities(35). Traditional Chinese businesses have been replaced by a large spectrum of both old and new types of businesses. The emerging types of entrepreneurial activities include wholesale trade, physicians and health services, finance, insurance, and real estate, hotels and motels, and import-export trade.

A variety of factors shape the development of these new niches. Hotels and motels is a good case in point. There are roughly 900 Chinese-owned hotels and motels in the Los Angeles area, far too many to serve an exclusively ethnic clientele. The Chinese have gravitated into this industry for two reasons. First, many newcomers arrive with capital, and they seek to buy commercial properties which they regard as safe investments. Second, the hotel and motel business can be run with a traditional family operation, in which unpaid family workers provide a crucial contribution.

Other business niches have developed as a result of the growing economic interdependence between the United States and some Asian countries such as Taïwan, Hong Kong, and China. The importance of the Pacific Rim connection to the economic activities of Los Angeles' Chinese immigrants can be seen in the emergence of hypermobile migrants who keep family in one society, business in the other, and are in constant motion between the two. With a « two-legged existence », one leg in the homeland and the other in the country of immigration, these

newcomers — called « spacemen » by English media and known in Taïwan as « Tai Kun Fei Jen » (the equivalent term for « spacemen » — represent a unique class of Chinese immigrants shuttling comfortably between Taipei, Hong Kong and such places as Los Angeles(36).

In general, « spacemen » fall into one of two categories. The first group consists of Hong Kong or Taïwan immigrants who still retain their business operation or professional practice in the place of origin. These people are either members of business elites (many are business owners of the equivalent to the Fortune 500 in Taïwan or Hong Kong) or well-established professionals such as lawyers, physicians or accountants who can earn much more money in their society of origin. However, they keep their families in Los Angeles for quality of life reasons, to pursue educational opportunities for their children, and to avoid potential political dislocations(37).

The second group consists of those immigrant entrepreneurs who have established their business base in Los Angeles, but remain heavily dependent on their human network back in their homeland and in other Chinese diaspora areas. This group of immigrants wants to link their ties to their respective homelands in Asia and open business frontiers in the Pacific Rim. They are called « transilient migrants » by Richmond who refers to those resource-rich, well-endowed, and skilled migrants who « leap across » geographical and political boundaries as facilitators of international business(38).

Chinese international traders, who act as facilitators of international trade between their respective homelands and the US, are the prototypical « spacemen » of this second type. For these traders, Los Angeles is a place where the newly emergent industrial societies of the Pacific Rim and advanced American capitalism can be fused, providing a marketing bridgehead to the world outside Asia and a gateway to American market. For example, the Taïwanese computer industry has relied on Chinese computer dealers in Los Angeles to penetrate the North American market. In turn, this linkage has led to the proliferation of Chinese computer dealerships.

Contrast : Both New York and Los Angeles contain vibrant Chinese ethnic economies. Both cities have now surpassed past San Francisco as the most important centers of Chinese business activity, with Los Angeles boasting the nation's largest, and New York, the second largest concentration of Chinese-owned firms. In both cities, population growth as spurred diversification of the ethnic economy(39).

But the two cities support dramatically different ethnic economies. Data from the 1980 Census of Population show that low-skill, low-wage industries provided the base of Chinese economic activity in New York, with more than 50 % of Chinese workers employed either in garments or in restaurants. By contast, just over a fifth of Chinese Angelenos worked in these two trades ; service industries requiring higher-levels of education, such as health, education, banking, or real estate, played a much more important role in Los Angeles. The occupational structures of the two communities mirrored the divergent industrial patterns. While Chinese Angelenos worked overwhelmingly in white-collar jobs — with

33 % in managerial and professional jobs alone — Chinese New Yorkers were mainly engaged in proletarian occupations, of which semi-skilled operatives and service workers were the most numerous.

TABLE 6 : *Occupational Structure of the Chinese in Los Angeles an New York, 1980*

	New York city %	Los Angeles %
Managers	8,8	16,5
Professionals	8,6	16,3
Technical workers	2,7	6,8
Sales	6,4	9,4
Clerical Workers	10,1	14,1
Private Household	0,8	1,1
Service Workers	25,1	14,4
Precision Product Workers	5,4	6,7
Operators	30,6	12,4
Laborers	1,3	1,5

Source : US Census of Population, Public Use Microdata Sample, 1980 ; data for employed, foreign-born, 20-65 years old only.

As the 1990 Census is not yet available, exact comparisons of 1980 with 1990 patterns can not yet be made. However, up-to-date information from Chinese Business Directories paints a reasonably reliable picture of the shape of the ethnic economies : these data show that the patterns already in place more than a decade ago seem to have remained more or less unchanged. Los Angeles has a far more diversified industrial structure than New York, with many fewer garment factories, and a much greater proliferation of business in advanced services for which high-level, formal training is required.

TABLE 7 : *Chinese-owned Businesses by Industry Los Angeles, New York*

Businesses	Los Angeles* 1992 N	New York** 1988 N
Restaurant	860	781
Physician	823	300
Real Estate	541	320***
Dentist	460	98
Hotel & Motel	280	—****
Attorney	269	186
Insurance	245	—
Auto Repairing	238	—
Contractors	225	—
Beauty Salon	222	111
Banks	221	39
Computer Dealer	219	—
Import & Export	206	164
Acupuncturist	203	—
Accountant	201	107
Garment Factory	24	437
Grocery Store	129	187
Travel Agency	161	115
Herbalist	67	101

Note : This table contained those industries 200 or more establishments in Los Angeles in 1992, plus those with 100 or more in New York in 1988.

* Source : Chinese Community Yellow Pages, 1989, 1992.
** Portes and Zhou, *op. cit.*, table 7.
*** In Portes and Zhou's Table, this figure represents the number of real estate, insurance and stockbrokers combined.
**** « - » not available.

POLITICS

Although political activity has been a salient characteristic of the ethnic experience in the United States, the Chinese have historically maintained a low political profile. Political quiescence, however, is increasingly a thing of the past : growing numbers and expanded economic power increase the potential for Chinese influence ; and the current political climate sanctions, when not encouraging, mobilization along explicitly ethnic group lines. All these factors are at work in Los Angeles and in New York ; and in both cities, Chinese political mobilization is on the rise. Nonetheless, the basic patterns of political incorporation differ strikingly, reflecting the differences in the socio-economic characteristics of the Chinese population and in their modes of economic and social integration, as well as disparities in the political systems of the two areas.

New York : New York's political system has long been characterized by a high level of ethnic segmentation ; since the mass arrival of the Irish in the mid 19th century, politics has been a vehicle for the expression of ethnic interests and a means for the organization of ethnic conflict. The pattern of ethnic group incorporation is linked to basic patterns of political conflict, in which the succession of one migrant wave after another ensures a continuing competitive conflict over political influence. Members of ethnic groups that have gained privileged access to political resources, that is to say municipal jobs or services, have tended to exclude outsiders, who have then sought to achieve inclusion through political mobilization along ethnic lines. This pattern of competitive ethnic mobilization characterizes the history of Irish, Jewish, Italian, Black, Puerto Rican, and most recently Caribbean ethnic politics in New York(40).

Thus New York presents newcomer groups with a segmented political system that is organized for mobilization along ethnic group lines and a political culture that sanctions, indeed encourages newcomers to engage in ethnic politics. But for most of their history in New York, Chinese have been external to this system of ethnic political segmentation. The small size of the Chinese population gave it little electoral weight. Moreover, the earlier waves of hostility had led to a distinctive relationship between the Chinese and the political institutions of American society. The Chinese fell back on themselves, maintaining peaceful, but arms-distance relations with political elites ; in return Chinatown elites were implicitly granted self-policing, self governing rights. Merchants were the long acknowledged leaders of Chinatown, maintaining their control of Chinatown through dominance of the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association, more generally known as the Chinese Six Companies »(41).

In New York, as in other cities, this relationship broke down in the late 1960s, to be replaced with a pattern common to other groups. Three factors were responsible for this shift : first, the attitudes of external elites changed, as local, political officials sought to mobilize poor, minority populations as part of the anti-poverty program. Second, the immigrant influx increased the visibility of poverty in Chinatown, and of the problems associated with it. Third, a younger, American-educated group emerged, oriented toward political activism along the lines established by other minority groups, and seeking to break with the political quiescence of Chinatown elites(42). Consequently, as Chia-ling Kuo has argued, « the anti-poverty program ended the century-long isolation of Chinatown »(43). Government and foundation support led to the formation of « modern social service organizations », such as the Chinatown Planning Council, the Chinatown Health Clinic, and the Chinatown Advisory Council, all of which are staffed by Chinese professionals, which provide direct services (such as child care, language instruction, legal aid, etc.). While also acting as local pressure groups seeking to influence political decisions.

From this point on, politics in the Chinese community have followed the typical path of ethnic politics. Territorial issues, as with other ethnic groups, have assumed considerable importance. These issues have involved inter-ethnic competition, as when Chinese interests have been pitted against those of their Jewish, Puerto Rican, or Italian neighbors in conflict over access to housing or over preservation of « Little Italy », now an integral part of Chinatown. Territorial conflict has also pitted the « community » against local government, as in an

ultimately unsuccessful attempt by City government to build a city prison in the middle of Chinatown.

If ethnic lobbying and protesting is the first step in ethnic political incorporation, electoral politics is the second. In the late 1980s, population growth put electoral politics on the local Chinese political agenda. One indicator of the growing electoral importance of Asian votes was former New York City Mayor Edward Koch's decision to open an office of Asian Affairs to act as a liaison between City Government and the Asian community in 1987 ; that office has since been maintained by Mayor David Dinkins, who was elected in 1989. By 1990, Chinese political activists set their sights on elected office, hoping that the ethnic and demographic changes that had occured during the 1980s would allow for the creation of a predominantly Asian electoral district. But with Chinese naturalization rates too low to provide a Chinese majority in Chinatown, competition erupted with Hispanics in a neighboring area erupted over how best to draw district lines. This first round of the conflict went to the Chinese activists, as Chinatown was made part of an electoral district including many white, rather than Hispanic, voters. In the end, however, Chinese electoral efforts failed, as voters in lower Manhattan and in Flushing opted for white candidates, rather than their Chinese opponents(44).

Los Angeles : In contrast to New York, where the Chinese population is concentrated within city boundaries, in Los Angeles the Chinese have moved outside the limits of Los Angeles city ; consequently, their political impact is principally felt in the small, suburban cities, elsewhere in Los Angeles county. Here, the Chinese encounter a very different political system from New York's ; rather than a tradition of ethnic segmentation, the pattern has been one of monoethnic dominance, with a relatively undifferentiated white population firmly in control. By converging on relatively small cities with less than 100,000 inhabitants, unlike New York with its population of 7,3 millions, the Chinese have had an immediate impact on local politics(45).

The basic pattern is exemplified by developments in Monterey Park where the influx of Chinese immigrants dramatically altered the city's residential, commercial and class features, much to the dismay of established, white residents. Development pressures resulting from the inflow of Chinese capital pitted Chinese newcomers against established white residents. Chinese investors engaged in widespread real estate acquisition, much of it for speculative reasons, driving up the price of local real estate. In turn, speculation led to extensive apartment construction, since to profit from their sizeable investments many Chinese developers built multi-unit, two-story condominium complexes. Whereas these apartment complexes offered spacious accommodations for Chinese immigrants coming from overcrowded countries such as Taïwan and Hong Kong, established residents' reacted with dismay, as multi-unit dwellings replaced single, detached houses and led to increased density. Commercial development had a similar effect. While the proliferation of Chinese business revitalized the commercial life in Monterey Park, which had lost business to newer shopping complexes in adjacent suburbs, the growth of Chinese stores meant that white customers had fewer local shopping outlets which catered to their needs. Other by-products of the burgeoning Chinese ethnic economy — the many Chinese-language signs and the traffic congestion resulting from the inflow of Chinese shoppers from nearby cities — futher upset local, white residents.

Finally, the migration overturned the traditional patterns of ethnic stratification. White residents, long accustomed to enjoying high status in their community, found themselves surpassed by the newcomers, who ranked significantly higher in income, property-ownership, and education. The politics of resentment quickly followed, with whites complaining that their new Chinese neighbors had bypassed the customary immigrant mobility pattern, moving into middle-class neighborhoods prior to assimilation, rather than the other way around.

Thus, local politics in Monterey Park crystallized around issues of white resentment and Chinese interest mobilization. In 1986, the Monterey city council passed an English Only ordinance which made English the city's official language. Next, an anti-development movement supported by longtime residents starded a successful campaign to defeat pro-development members of the city council. The newly formed, anti-development city council quickly put a curb on residential and commercial development, a shift that principally affected the Chinese.

In turn, these events spurred mobilization among the city's Chinese. Chinese business owners established an organization to oppose the English-only and anti-development ordinances. In 1987, several Chinese businessmen organized an unsuccessful campaign to recall two white, anti-development city council members. In 1989, a group of local business owners organized the Chinese American Civil Rights Foundation to fight an ordinance limiting the number of Chinese signs, and then filed a lawsuit seeking to overturn the ordinance on constitutional grounds.

In the end, as Horton has noted, an alternative strategy combining « the implicit promise of Asian representation with the explicit promise of support for managed growth within a framework of diversity » bridged conflict between newcomers and established residents(46). By 1990, two Chinese-Americans were elected to the city council, both receiving an overwhelming majority of Chinese votes also drawing support from other ethnic groups. These two Chinese-American officials made common cause with a multi-ethnic coalition designed to reach accommodation between established residents and newcomers. Consequently, Monterey Park entered the 1990s with a Chinese-American mayor and a city council that has taken a neutral stance toward the development issues that previously divided the city.

Elsewhere in the San Gabriel Valley, the political encounter between Chinese newcomers and established Anglo residents has been more contained. Nonetheless, the same sources of conflit are present and many local governments are anxious that their city will become the next Monterey Park — concerns that are often manifested in ordinances restricting the proportion of Chinese characters on any commercial sign. For their part, the immigrants have attempted to sidestep contention and seek more harmonious relationships. In Arcadia, for example, the Chinese American Association has sought to develop a working relationship with local government, sponsoring free annual trip to Taïwan for district administrators and local teachers.

Contrast : In New York, the Chinese have moved from outsiders to actors on the city's political stage in the years since the renewal of mass immigration. While the political system encourages ethnic politics, demography sharply limits the potential for Chinese political influence. Though grown in numbers, Chinese still represent a small proportion of New York's total population, with little chance of ever becoming a block of swing voters. Limited population size and territorial concentration focus their political attention on the politics of sub-local areas within New York City boundaries. Even within these areas, the Chinese lack the numbers needed to gain control of political office and they find themselves in competition with other ethnic groups, many of which are also of Chinese ethnic interests is unlikely to lead to conflict with dominant political elites. Though it remains the hub of Chinese political activities, Chinatown is a low-income, stigmatized area, where few white residents live. And in New York's fractured, multiethnic polity, where a white/black axis defines political fault lines, Chinese are more likely to ally with whites, than with either blacks or Hispanics.

The political impact of Chinese immigration to Los Angeles has been registered in a very different way. In contrast to New York, where the Chinese presence is felt within city boundaries, and virtually absent in suburban areas, the impact in Los Angeles is the reverse. Los Angeles city holds a diminishing portion of the area's growing Chinese population. Though a Chinese-American politician was recently elected to the Los Angeles city council, he represents an ethnically-mixed district and presents himself as a panethnic politician expressing the interests of a multitude of Los Angeles' new immigrant groups.

Outside Los Angeles city boundaries, however, the situation is very different. Because the immigration has converged on relatively small communities, the Chinese have quickly altered the political balance. Unlike New York, where the Chinese compete with other, lower status immigrant groups, in suburban Los Angeles they encounter middle-class Anglos, who find their communities transformed by the immigrant influx. Consequently, political conflict arises over the material and symbolic impacts of Chinese immigration on Anglo communities.

CONCLUSION

The new immigrants to the United States comprise an extraordinarily diverse population, marked by significant *inter-* and *intra-* ethnic differences. Taking immigrant diversity seriously, we argue, adds, insight to the problems that afflict research on the latest wave of newcomers to the United States.

How to characterize contemporary Chinese immigration to the United States is one such problem. Optimistic accounts portray Chinese as relatively privileged, advancing rapidly, and achieving entry into the middle-class with little conflict. In this view, the Chinese experience is a success story, to be held up to other groups as an example of what a « model minority » can do. By contrast, more pessimistic portrayals contend that the latest wave of migration from China has pushed newcomers into overcrowded ghettos, where they are restricted from access to mainstream and vulnerable to the coercive practices of better-off members of their

own group. The success of some highly visible individual immigrants, notwithstanding, the experience of contemporary Chinese experience is not a success, but an exploitation story.

But what are conventionally presented as mutually exclusive accounts lood different in light of our comparative case study. Los Angeles and New York are the destinations of very different Chinese migration streams ; these differences in initial, pre-migration characteristics have led to divergent patterns of development. Los Angeles appears much more like the conventional success story ; New York seems to offer an updated version of a harsh 19th century immigrant story. Attention to diversity, moreover, modifies the simplicities of both accounts. In Los Angeles, Chinese immigrants are indeed moving up rapidly, but through an ethnic economy, and are finding that mobility leads to conflict with established, middle-class white residents. In New York, where Chinese immigrants work at the bottom levels of the economy, only a minority have settled in Chinatown, settling instead in areas of better housing quality. While the first generation moves up at a slow pace, their protracted rate of mobility has diminished the potential for competition whith more powerful, established groups.

Thus, appreciating diversity adds complexity to our understanding of the immigrant experience. In so doing we also move beyond some of the simplistic intellectual conflicts that have impeded progress in this field.

Notes et références bibliographiques

(1) PERSONS (S.), *Ethnic Studies in Chicago, 1905-1945,* Chicago : University of Chicago Press ; GORDON (M.), *Assimilation in American Life,* New York : Oxford University Press, 1964.

(2) EASTERLIN (R.), « Immigration : Social and Economic Characteristics », in S. Thernstrom, éd. *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups,* Cambridge, MA : Harvard University Press, 1980, pp. 480-81.

(3) US Department of Labor, 1989, *The Effects of Immigration on the US Economy and Labor Market,* Washington, DC : GPO.

(4) PORTES (A.) and RUMBAUT (R.), *Immigrant America.* Berkeley : University of California Press, 1990, p. 8.

(5) BOZORGMEHR (M.), « Internal Ethnicity among New Immigrants », Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Pacific Sociological Association, Oakland, CA, April 1992.

(6) This phrase was coined by Ivan Light in *Cities in World Perspective,* New York : Macmillan, 1983.

(7) This paragraph draws on a broad historical literature, including James Fawcett and Benjamin V. Carino. 1987. *Pacific Bridges,* New York : Center for Migration Studies ; Hsu, FLK 1971. *A Challenge to American Dream : The Chinese in the United States.* San Francisco : Wadsworth ; Rose Hum Lee. 1960. *The Chinese in the United States of America.* Hong Kong : Hong Kong University Press.

(8) TSAI (W.-H.), « Diversity and Conflict Between Old and New Chinese Immigrants in the United States », in *Sourcebook on the New Immigration : implications for the United States and the International Community,* edited by Roy Simon Bryce-Laporte, New Brunswick : Transaction Books, 1980 ; Sung, Betty Lee. 1980. « Polarity in the Make up of Chinese Immigrants » in *Sourcebook on the New Immigration : implications for the United States and the International Community* edited by Roy Simon Bryce-Laporte, New Brunswick : Transaction Books.

(9) NEE (V.) and DEBARY NEE (B.), *Longtime Californ' A Study of an American Chinatown,* New York : Pantheon, 1973, p. 253.

(10) For a history of US immigration policy, see David Reimers, *Still the Golden Door,* New York : Columbia University Press, 1985.

(11) *Annual Report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1990,* Table 2.

(12) Calculated from the *Annual Report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service* 1985-1990, table 20.

(13) Data from *Annual Report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service,* various years.

(14) For historical background on New York's Chinatown, see Bernard Wong, « A comparative study of the assimilation of the Chinese in New York City and Lima, Peru, « *Comparative Studies in Society and History,* V 20 (1978), 335-58 ; and *ibid,* « The Chinese : New Immigrants in New York's Chinatown », in N. Foner, ed. « *New Immigrants in New York's Chinatown* », in N. Foner, ed. *New Immigrants in New York,* New York : Columbia University Press, 1987, pp. 243-72. Data on the occupations of the Chinese are from the 1960 Census of Population ; data on residential patterns come from Abeles, Schwartz, Haeckel, and Silverblatt, *The Chinatown Garment Industry Study,* New York : International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, 1981.

(15) This paragraph draws on Charles Choy Wong, 1979, *Ethnicity, Work and Community : The Case of Chinese in Los Angeles.* Ph. D. Dissertation, Department of Sociology, UCLA. Data on occupational patterns are from the 1960 Census of Population.

(16) WALDINGER (R.), « Immigration and Urban Change », *Annual Review of Sociology,* V. 15, 1989, pp. 211-232.

(17) A census tract is an enumeration district containing several thousand people and used for census purposes.

(18) 1970 data from Abeles, Schwartz, Haeckel, and Silverblatt, *op. cit.,* 1980, 1990 data from Census of Population.

(19) Abeles, Schwartz, Haeckel, and Silverblatt, *op. cit.,* p. 120.

(20) KINCAID (G.), « Chinatown, Part I », *The New Yorker,* June 6, 1991, p. 65.

(21) BOGEN (E.), *Immigration in New York,* New York : Praeger, 1987 ; Roger Waldinger, « Beyond Nostalgia : the old neighborhood revisited », *New York Affairs,* 1987, V. 10, pp. 1-10.

(22) 1970 data from B. Wong, *op. cit.,* 1980, 1990 data from Census of Population.

(23) WONG (C.-C.), *ibid.,* Mark Arax, « Monterey Park, Nation's First Suburban Chinatown », *Los Angeles Times,* April 6, 1987.

(24) Data from 1980, 1990 Census of Population.

(25) Population data from 1980, 1990 Census of Population.

(26) WALDINGER (R.), ALDRICH (H.), WARD (R.) and associates, *Ethnic Entrepreneurs : Immigrant Business in Industrial Societies,* Newbury Park, CA : Sage, 1990, Chapter 2.

(27) BAILEY (T.), *Immigrant and Native Workers : Contrasts and Competition,* Boulder, Colo : Westview, 1987 ; Kwong, Peter. 1987. *The New Chinatown,* N.-Y. : Hill and Wang.

(28) WALDINGER (R.), *Through the Eye of the Neddle : Immigrants and Enterprise in New York's Garment Trades,* New York : New York University Press, 1987.

(29) PORTES (A.) and ZHOU (M.), « Gaining the Upper Hand : Old and New Perspectives in the Study of Ethnic Minorities », unpublished manuscript, Johns Hopkins University, « En route vers les sommets : nouvelles perspectives sur les minorités ethniques », *Revue Européenne des Migrations Internationales,* vol. 8, n° 1, 1992 ; WALDINGER, ALDRICH, WARD, and associates, p. 69.

(30) WONG (C.-C.), *op. cit.,* p. 76, 106-160.

(31) WONG (C.-C.), *ibid.,* Chapter 7.

(32) WONG (C. C.), « Monterey Park : A Community in Transition », in *Frontiers of Asian American Researches,* edited by Gail M. Nomura et al., Seattle, Wash : University of Washington Press, 1989.

(33) HORTON (J.), « The Politics of Diversity in Monterey Park, California », in Louise Lamphere, ed. *Structuring Diversity : Ethnographic Perspectives on Immigration,* Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1992, p. 224.

(34) 1983 data from Horton, *ibid.,* p. 224 ; 1992 data calculated from Asia Media Systems, Inc., *Chinese Business Directory, 1992.*

(35) The remaining paragraphs in this section draw on field work by Yenfen Tseng.

(36) KOTKIN (J.), 1991. « The "Spacemen" Have Landed » California Magazine, March : 20-21 ; Tien, Chu-Ying. 1992. « Tai Kun Fei Jen » (Spacemen : New Type of Taïwanese Immigrants ». Business Weekly, Jan. 19 : 20-32. Taipei ; Although the Statistics for this group of « spacemen » is hard to estimate, the fact that there are now four direct non-stop air flights daily between Taipei and Los Angeles (an increase from none such direct flight between these two places in 1987) and similar increase in number of flights between Hong Kong and Los Angeles at least indicates the tremendous demand of travelling around Pacific.

(37) WOO (T.-M.), 1989. The Adaptation of Recent Chinese Immigrants : A Qualitative Study, Ph. D. Dissertation, Washington State University.

(38) RICHMOND (A.), « International Migration and Global Change », paper presented at International Conference on Migration organized by Center for Advanced Studies, National University of Singapore, 1991.

(39) US Bureau of the Census, *Survey of Minority-Owned Business Enterprises,* 1982, 1987 (Washington, DC : US. Department of Commerce).

(40) For a discussion of the system of ethnic political segmentation, see Martin Shefter, *Political Crisis, Fiscal Crisis*, New York : Basic Books, 1985 ; for a discussion of ethnic politics among one of the newest of immigrant groups, see Philip Kasinitz, *Caribbean New Yorkers*, Ithaca, NY : Cornell University Press, 1992.

(41) LYMAN (S.-M.), *Chinese Americans*, New York : Random House, 1974.

(42) LIGHT (I.) and CHOY WONG (Ch.), « Protest of Work : Dilemmas of the Tourist Industry in American Chinatowns », *American Journal of Sociology*, V. 80, 6 (1975) : 1342-1368.

(43) KUO (Ch.-L.), *Social and Political Change in New York's Chinatown*, New York, Praeger, 1977, p. 45 and *passim*.

(44) LEE (F.-R.), « Blocs Battle to Draw Chinatown's New Council Map » *The New York Times*, April 30, 1991, B1 ; James C. McKinley, Jr., « New Voices to Mold Power Balance in the New York City Council », September 13, 1991.

(45) This section draws on Horton, *op. cit.*, and field work in Monterey Park by Yenfen Tseng.

(46) HORTON (J.), *op. cit.*, p. 230.

Divergentes diasporas : les communautés chinoises de New York et de Los Angeles

Roger WALDINGER et Yenfen TSENG

Les universitaires devraient prendre en compte le fait que la diversité socio-économique est l'un des traits les plus marquants de l'immigration depuis le milieu des années soixante. Cet article compare la situation des Chinois de Los Angeles avec celle de New York afin de souligner la diversité interne de ces deux communautés et la différenciation qui en résulte. Nous pensons que ces deux communautés étaient à l'origine similaires, leur structure sociale était caractéristique des Chinois durant les cent premières années de leur installation. Alors que les deux communautés ont connu une croissance extraordinaire avec le renouveau de l'immigration de masse des Chinois au milieu des années soixante, leur mode de développement a divergé de manière accrue.

Divergent Diasporas : the Chinese Communities of New York and Los Angeles compared

Roger WALDINGER, Yenfen TSENG

While socio-economic diversity is a salient trait of the post-1965 newcomers, immigration scholars have yet to consider its full implications. This paper uses a comparison of the Chinese communities in Los Angeles and New York to show the importance of intra-immigrant diversity and the difference it makes. We argue that these two communities began from similar starting points, each exhibiting the social structure that had been commonly developed by Chinese-American communities during the first 100 years of the Chinese presence in the United States. While both communities have undergone tremendous growth since the renewal of mass Chinese immigration in the mid-1960s, their patterns of development have increasingly diverged. Whereas Los Angeles has become the favored destination of middle — and upper-middle-class immigrants, many of them from Taïwan, New York has received a heavily proletarian population originating in the People's Republic of China (PRC) and Hong Kong. These initial differences in the characteristics of arrivals have led to divergent trajectories of ethnic incorporation.

Diásporas Divergentes : las Comunidades Chinas de Nueva York y de Los Angeles

Roger WALDINGER et Yenfen TSENG

Los universitarios deberian tomar en consideración el hecho de que la diversidad económica es uno de los rasgos, de los más sobresalientes de la immigración desde mediados de los años sesenta. Este articulo compara la situación de los chinos de Los Angeles con la de los de Nueva York, con el fin de hacer recalcar la diversidad interna de estas dos comunidades y la diferencia resultante. Creemos que estas dos comunidades eran, en un principio, similares, su estructura social era caracteristica de los chinos de durante los cien primeros años de su establecimiento. Mientras que las dos comunidades han conocido un crecimiento extraoddinario con la renovacion de la immigración en masa de los chinos, a mediados de los años sesenta, su modo de desarrollo diverge de manera considerable.

Los Angeles se ha convertido en la destinaciòn preferida de la clase media immigrantre, procedente de Taïwan en su mayoria, mientras que Nueva york recibe una gran migración obrera procedente de la China y Hong Kong. Estas primeras caracteristicas difernetes han ocasionado trajectorías divergentes.